

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SINCO TECHNOLOGIES PTE LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SINCO ELECTRONICS (DONGGUAN)
CO. LTD., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-05517-EMC](#)

**ORDER RE WRITTEN DISCOVERY
DESIGNATIONS**

Docket Nos. 493, 514

This order addresses the objections made to written discovery designations.

I. PLAINTIFF'S WRITTEN DISCOVERY DESIGNATIONS (DOCKET NO. 493)

A. XingKe

1. RFA Set 1

- RFA No. 15. The objection is overruled. Although the RFA implicitly relates to SinCoo, nothing about the RFA or response ties XingKe to SinCoo.
- RFA No. 19. The objection is overruled. With respect to Defendants' MIL No. 2, the Court's main concern was to exclude agency adjudications of XingKe's applications.
- RFA No. 28. The objection is sustained in light of SinCo's agreement not to seek liability based on SinCoo.
- RFA No. 38. The objection is sustained. See above.
- RFA No. 48.3. The objection is sustained. The Court already addressed the alleged forged signature of Xu Shugong in ruling on Defendants' MIL No. 2.
- RFA No. 42. The objection is sustained. The Court excluded agency adjudications in

1 ruling on Defendants' MIL No. 2.

- 2 • RFA No. 44. The objection is sustained. See above.

3 2. Rog Set 1

- 4 • Rog No. 9. The Court expects the parties to resolve the completeness objection.
5 • Rog No. 12. The Court expects the parties to resolve the completeness objection.

6 B. Mr. Tjoa

7 1. RFA Set 1

- 8 • RFA No. 11. The objection is sustained. The parties have stipulated that trademark
9 applications were filed for "SinCo." Whether XingKe currently has a trademark
10 registration for "SinCo" essentially gets into the issue of agency adjudications.
11 • RFA No. 12. The objection is sustained. The parties have stipulated that trademark
12 applications have been filed for "XingKe." Whether there is currently a registration for
13 "XingKe" essentially gets into the issue of agency adjudications.

14 2. RFA Set 2

- 15 • RFA No. 62. The objection is overruled. The Court has allowed evidence that XingKe
16 filed trademark applications for "XingKe."
17 • RFA No. 81. The objection is sustained. This appears to be related to the alleged forgery
18 of Xu Shugong's signature, which the Court has excluded.

19 3. Rog Set 1 (Amended)

- 20 • Rog No. 4. The Court expects the parties to resolve the completeness objection.

21 **II. DEFENDANTS' WRITTEN DISCOVERY DESIGNATIONS (DOCKET NO. 514)**

22 The Court addresses first general objections raised by SinCo.

23 SinCo's general objection that the abandonment of the SinCo mark in China would not
24 mean abandonment worldwide (including the United States) is overruled. The Court has already
25 held that simply because action took place in China does not mean that it cannot have
26 consequences in the United States.

27 To the extent SinCo has made a general objection based on completeness, the Court
28 expects the parties to resolve the completeness issue.

1 A. RFA

- 2 • RFA No. 7. The objections are overruled.
- 3 • RFA No. 8. The objections are overruled.
- 4 • RFA No. 9. The objections are overruled.
- 5 • RFA No. 130. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
- 6 • RFA No. 131. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
- 7 • RFA No. 132. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
- 8 • RFA No. 133. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
- 9 • RFA No. 134. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.

10 B. Rog

- 11 • Rog No. 5. The objections are overruled.
- 12 • Rog No. 12. The objections are overruled.
- 13 • Rog No. 13. The objections are overruled.
- 14 • Rog No. 16. The objections are overruled.
- 15 • Rog No. 17. The objections are overruled.
- 16 • Rog No. 18. The objections are overruled.
- 17 • Rog No. 19. The objections are overruled.
- 18 • Rog No. 20. The objections are overruled.
- 19 • Rog No. 21. The objections are overruled.
- 20 • Rog No. 22. The objections are overruled.
- 21 • Rog No. 23. The objections are overruled.

22 C. RFA (Amended)

- 23 • RFA No. 5. The objections are overruled.
- 24 • RFA No. 6. The objections are overruled.
- 25 • RFA No. 142. The objections are overruled.
- 26 • RFA No. 143. The objections are overruled.
- 27 • RFA No. 144. The objections are overruled.

D. Rog (Amended)

- Rog No. 15. The objections are overruled.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 29, 2021



EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge